AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figures 1 is amended to include additional operations. No new matter is being

added.

     Attachment: One (1) Replacement sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 10, adds new claims 11-13, and replaces Fig. 1 of the drawings. Support for the amendments and the new added claims is found throughout the specification *e.g.*, at pages 4-5 of the specification as filed. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I.   Preliminary Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority and for indicating receipt of the certified copy of the Priority Document. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for returning the initialed Form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 16, 2004.

II.   Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-10 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The drawing is objected to under 37 C.F.R 1.83(a).

III.   Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because "Figure 1 appears to simply recite the claim language in a flow diagram format, instead of showing the claimed feature of the display of transmitted data with different display types according to data types." *See* page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to

withdraw this objection to the drawings in view of the self-explanatory amendment to the

drawings being made herein. No new matter is being added.

IV.   Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent No. 5,261,043 to Wolber et al. (hereinafter "Wolber") and WO 99/66651 to Elsbree

(hereinafter "Elsbree") and claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Wolber and Elsbree and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156969 to

Tadokoro et al. (hereinafter "Tadokoro"). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of

rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

In conventional techniques, individually created operator modules for individually

selected process data are used to create dialog boxes on operator interfaces to display process

data, status data, control and/or regulating data of an industrial process installation. The process

of designing such operator modules is very time consuming because the user typically needs to

determine for each of the data, the type and how the data is graphically displayed on the operator

interface. Furthermore, the user has to take care of the match of different data types.

In an exemplary, non-limiting embodiment, however, such a conventional design system

is not required to generate dialog boxes for displaying data of a process installation. Instead, a

"first dialog box is saved in a graphic library that is stored in the computer user station . . . [that]

need not be created by the user." *See* paragraph no. [009] of the specification. The user only

selects in that first dialog box at least one process installation data to be displayed, assigns it to a

certain stored data type and indicates the memory address of the respective data.

As a result, at least one dialog box is automatically generated, that displays the

transmitted data of the process installation on the user station. That is possible because

assignments between data types and display types are stored in the system. *See* paragraph no.

[010] of the specification. Accordingly, such an exemplary embodiment can be used to save

time and to automate the creation of dialog boxes for displaying data of a process installation.

It will be appreciated that the foregoing remarks relate to the invention in a general sense,

the remarks are not necessarily limitative of any claims and are intended only to help the

Examiner better understand the distinguishing aspects of the claims mentioned further below.

Claims 1-3 and 5-10

Claims 1 and 10, *inter alia*, recite a method comprising "assigning . . . data . . . to . . . data

types." The grounds of rejection maintain that Wolber teaches this feature at col. 2, lines 27-40

and 63-68 by providing a method to automatically <u>convert</u> data of one type to an accepted

another data type. *See* pages 3 and 6 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Wolber discloses "an iconic programming system to specify data input constraints on any

terminal of any icon of an iconic network program." *See* Abstract, lines 1-4. An iconic

programming system is an environment that does not require the use of a programming language.

See col. 1, lines 27-56. However, the use of a programming language assures that there is no

type mismatch when data is transferred between devices. To avoid such type mismatches,

Wolber <u>converts</u> data types to acceptable types. In other words, Wolber discloses converting

data to another data type and <u>not assigning</u> the transmitted data to a stored data type.

In addition, claims 1 and 10 also, *inter alia*, recite "<u>automatically</u> generating the at least

one display box . . . so as to display the data." With respect to this unique feature of claims 1 and

10, the grounds of rejection maintain that Wolber teaches this feature at col. 4, lines 38-67.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The constraint dialog box in Wolber is <u>not automatically</u> generated. Instead, it is

generated as a result of a user request to display the constraints for an input terminal. *See* col. 4,

lines 43-49. Furthermore, the constraint dialog box is designed to obtain user input and <u>not to</u>

<u>display data of the installation process</u>.

As a result, Wolber fails to disclose or suggest the unique features of claims 1 and 10.

Elsbree is relied upon only for its alleged disclosure of the transmitted data as being data of an

industrial process installation (*see* page 4 of the Office Action) and as such fails to cure the

deficient disclosure of Wolber. Together, the combined teachings of Wolber and Elsbree would

not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter

of claims 1 and 10.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 10 are patentable over Wolber and

Elsbree at least by virtue of the aforementioned differences. Since claims 2-3 and 5-9 depend on

claim 1, they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 4

Claim 4 depends on claim 1. Applicant has already demonstrated that Wolber in view of

Elsbree does not meet all the requirements of independent claim 1. Tadokoro is relied upon only

for its alleged disclosure of the dialog box being assigned to a library stored in the computer user

station. (see page 8 of the Office Action) and as such fails to cure the deficient disclosure of

Wolber in view of Elsbree. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not

have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of

claims 1 and 4. Since claim 4 depends on claim 1, it is patentable at least by virtue of its

dependency.

V.   New Claims

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claims 11-13, which are

patentable by virtue of their dependency on claim 1 and for additional features set forth therein.

VI.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/
Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 4, 2007